

17 February 1969

25X1A
MEMORANDUM FOR:

SUBJECT : Review of ELINT Study.

I have reviewed the ELINT Study and, while the effort is certainly a relatively comprehensive one, I feel that there is a serious imbalance among the topics discussed. Specifically, my comments are as follows:

1. A considerable part of the Study effort is concerned with a reporting analysis of the three-month period over a year ago. While this certainly highlights the deficiencies that were existing at that time (and might still exist now) the credibility of the analysis could either be criticized as being dated and no longer relevant or easily rectified by proper guidance.
2. The relevance of the 2x2 or 8x8 analysis of ELINT evaluation does not, in my mind, present the sophistication of the analysis that has been undertaken for EOB and GS tasks applying, as well to TI tasks. Relegating the methodology developed to an appendix is an injustice to the analysis undertaken.
3. To be certain, discussion of the relative effectiveness analysis undertaken is reviewed in the results section, but it is my feeling that this analysis is completely overshadowed by the reporting analysis discussed under (1.) above.
4. The study also has a strong undercurrent running throughout. It is clearly implied that the DIA study was absolutely essential in carrying out this analysis. This is an overstatement. While it was indispensable as an input to the reporting analysis, its importance to the relative effectiveness analysis is, at least, questionable. It is my judgment that the relative effectiveness analysis is more important than the reporting analysis. Hence, the indispensability of the DIA study is questionable.

Alternative recommendations are as follows:

1. Invert the order of the reporting analysis and the relative effectiveness analysis. That is, primary emphasis should be placed on the relative effectiveness analysis, and this topic in a more fully expanded version, be discussed first, followed by an abbreviated version of the reporting analysis.
2. Key the relative effectiveness as a separate volume and cross reference the materials in that volume.

While the second alternative minimizes the time spent in rewrite, I recommend against it, since I sense that this might be construed as downplaying the importance of this analysis. Consequently, I recommend the first alternative. What is implied is the incorporation of the methodology in the body of the report and discarding the single examples discussed. In addition, the results of the relative effectiveness analysis would be expanded, possibly including a sample run of the full-scale problem which in a sense would furnish "proof" that the large scale problem was, indeed, solved. Finally, the amount of space devoted to the reporting analysis would be substantially reduced.

I do not believe that these views have been colored by any association with the relative effectiveness analysis. It is based on my belief that policy makers are more concerned with how future performance could be improved, rather than with how deficient the past collection effort has been.

25X1A

